

I am again indebted to you for your Mem- on nomenclature in all of which I entirely agree - I am very glad that you concur in thinking it best to limit the new Nomenclator to names actually published. I had at first more ambitious views but the further I have gone into the matter the more I am convinced that we must adhere to that limit. Future monographers & systematists working at Kew may properly as you recommend quote Benth's work in Herb Kew - but if we set Mr Jackson, who knows a good deal about botanical books but nothing of plants, on such a work we should add years to the time needed for completing the work & add a large number of blunders to its pages.

Many of the points noticed in your mem. have been forced on my attention during the past winter.

10 Southwell Gardens London. SW  
20 April, 84

My dear Dr Gray

Your letter of the 21<sup>st</sup> March was most welcome - After much deliberation I have secured a cabin in the Gallia for the trip leaving Liverpool on June 14 for New York - I wish we could have fixed an earlier date as I somewhat dread the great heat of summer in the Eastern & Central States both for myself & my wife -

Our subsequent proceedings are still uncertain - the main point being to decide on my wife's course - She is rather

disposed to undertake the journey  
as far as Colorado and to make  
her head quarters at Colorado  
Springs, while I see as much  
as I can of that region & of  
California - returning eastward  
in August. But I have not  
yet made up my mind to this  
arrangement knowing how  
liable she is to suffer <sup>seriously</sup> from  
overfatigue in travelling - The  
wiser course I am sure w<sup>d</sup> be  
for her to remain at some  
sea-side place on the east coast -

The Sowell's speak highly of  
Mount Desert and Hooker suggests  
Beverly or somewhere near it  
on the coast of Massachusetts -  
He adds that you & Mrs Gray

sometimes go in summer to that  
neighbourhood & this of course  
w<sup>d</sup> be a strong inducement -  
One element in my calculations  
as to touring in the far west is  
that of expense - At the best an  
American tour must cost a good  
deal more than our usual trips  
to the Alps & Italy, and of course  
the long railway journeys must  
come to a good sum -

The Canadians have raised a  
fund to lessen the cost of the  
voyage to members of the British  
Association but I have not  
thought it right to apply for  
a share as I understood that  
there are many applicants  
who probably ~~to~~ can afford  
the expense less than I can.

in deciding our plans

With our very kind remembrances  
to Mrs Gray

always sincerely yours

John Ball

P.S. It would seem that no botanist  
has collected (or collected & published)  
at or about Chicha, the terminus of  
the line planned from Lima to Oroya -  
No doubt there were no facilities, & no  
special inducement, before the railway  
was constructed. In three days spent  
in and about Chicha I collected a  
good many new & interesting plants  
enough to make up a little Sentulum  
Audinum. There will be in the next  
Journal of the Linn. Soc. a little paper  
of mine on Patagonia of which I will send  
you a copy - I received just after it was in type  
Lorentz & Naudulin Botany of the Expedition to the Rio Negro  
of Wk. I will send you a notice.

while working & naming my  
South American collections -

There is one branch of the  
nomenclature question - not of the  
first importance but arising often  
enough to deserve consideration  
and a positive decision, as to which  
you have never as far as I  
recollect pronounced yourself -  
namely the specific name for a  
plant which has been referred to  
several different generic groups.

I refer as a typical instance to that  
cited by me in Journal of Botany  
for 1877 p 359 - *Spergularia diandra*  
Boiss - Guss. (sub *Arucusis*.)

On the one hand you have the  
logical argument - The name of a plant  
is a binomial - The first published (binomial)  
is entitled to preference - the plant in  
question is a *Spergularia* - therefore it

should be called *Spergularia patens* Hochst.

Alph. de Candolle agrees that the rule should be to prefer the earlier specific designation - and would say Hochstetter ought to have written *Spergularia diandra* but he shrinks from asserting that the rule though neglected in the first instance should be subsequently enforced. But what is the use of the rule if it may be broken with impunity -

Are you to allow men like Mr Gandoger instead of coining new names for each slight variety of common plants - over 4000 new names for roses - to attain the great object of perpetuating his own name by coining new specific names for hundreds or thousands of plants whose generic ~~position~~ title has been altered by Bentham & Willd.

Baillon or others -

Are we to have to learn & to adopt new specific names for the Andean *Lucilias* & hundred of others made up by any one who may bid defiance to A. de Candolle's laws?

And if you adopt a law for the future are you not to apply it for the past - saving of course the higher rule *quiesca non movere* - keep the name whatever it is that has received the consensus of the chief authorities.

This is the only remaining question connected with the Nomenclature that I regard as yet unsettled & I should much like to know your opinion.

If you have decided on the place or places where you & Mrs Gray are likely to spend the summer the information might weigh much